REMARKS

The Office Action mailed March 4, 2008 noted that claims 1-4, 8-17, 19, 20 and 22 were pending for reconsideration, that claims 5-7, 18 and 21 have been withdrawn from consideration and rejected claims 1-4, 8-17, 19, 20 and 22. Claims 1, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, 20 and 22 have been amended, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-4, 8-17, 19, 20 and 22 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The rejections are traversed below.

The Office Action rejected claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. section 101 as non-statutory. The claims have been amended in consideration of the Examiner's comments and it is submitted they satisfy the requirements of the statute. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Page 4 of the Office Action rejected claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 11-13, 15-17, 19, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Biederman and alleged well known art (Official Notice) of Odryna, Thomas, Pinkston, Coleman and Perholtz. Page 7 of the Office Action rejects claims 2, 3, 10 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Biederman and Kilkki.

Biederman is asserted to teach the switching of the claims in figure 2 and col. 2, lines 24-55 and to teach the compression and the changing of the compression of the claims in figure 2.

Biederman includes a packet compression selector 202 (see figure 2) that specifies which of several compression units 204 a packet is to be compressed by or that specifies that the packet is to not be compressed.

> Based on the contents of each packet and, in one embodiment, the degree of
> network congestion currently being experienced, packet compression selector
> 202 either forwards each packet to a selected one of compression units 204, or
> designates particular packets to be forwarded with their contents uncompressed.

(See Biederman, col. 6, lines 17-22)

The particular compression unit 204 (A, B, C or no compression) as noted above is based on the "contents" of each packet.

> Packet compression selector 202 typically determines whether to compress a
> packet, as well as how much to compress the packet, depending upon the
> contents of the packet.

(See Biederman, col. 5, lines 60-63)

> In general, data that is relatively easy to compress, e.g., data which is
> compressed and uncompressed relatively quickly, is compressed to save the time
> required to perform compression operations on data which is more difficult to
> compress, while freeing bandwidth for the transmission of data which is more
> difficult to compress. The degree of network congestion, or the overall network

> congestion level, may be a factor in the determination of the level or degree of
> compression which is used to compress data, if data is to be compressed at all.

(See Biederman, col. 6, lines 22-32)

That is, in Biederman the routing or forwarding of the packets to the compression units, and therefore the compression, is based on the contents of the packets. And the routing is accomplished by forwarding the packets. (forward: 1: to help onward : PROMOTE <*forwarded* his friend's career>2 a: to send forward : TRANSMIT <will *forward* the goods on receipt of your check> b: to send or ship onward from an intermediate post or station in transit <*forward* mail> - see Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary copyright © 2009 by Merriam-Webster, Incorporated)

In contrast, claim 1 calls for "a switching circuit switching between image signals outputted from the computers responsive to a remote control signal". That is, the image signals are not forwarded but rather switched by a switching circuit which is very different from Biederman. And the switching is based on a remote control signal, also very different from Biederman.

Further, figure 1 of the above-identified application depicts that the KVM switch has a number of image processing units which can simultaneously compress image signals from the servers where the compressed signals are sent to remote computers over a network. Claim 1 emphasizes switching circuits that switch between image signals from the computers responsive to a remote control signal and where the image signals are simultaneously compressed and sent to the remote-access computers over the network. In contrast, as shown in Biederman figure 2 and discussed in col. 6, a packet is selected to be routed to only one of the compression units 2004 (A, B, C or NO).

The alleged known art (Official Notice) of Odryna, Thomas, Pinkston, Coleman and Perholtz as well as Kilkki add nothing to Biederman with respect to the above discussed features.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is requested.

Claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, 20 and 22 also emphasize switching with a switching signal based on a remote control signal and simultaneous compression.

It is submitted that the independent claims distinguish over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite

additional features not shown to be taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 2. emphasizes "a packet filtering circuit that adds up a packet data amount received through the network interface circuit." Claim 3 emphasizes "the number of the image processing units being the same as the number of the remote-control computers." Claim 4 emphasizes "the controller reports the changed compression method or compression rate to a remote-control computer." Biederman and Kilkki, as well as the alleged known art (official notice) of Odryna, Thomas, Pinkston, Coleman and Perholtz, have not been shown to teach or suggest such. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101. It is also submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

<div style="text-align:center">

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

</div>

Date: _____6/3/9_____   By: ___/J. Randall Beckers/_____
                                                  J. Randall Beckers
                                                  Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501